

REMARKS

[0001] Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 7-35, 37, and 39-47 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1 and 46-47. No claims are added, withdrawn, or cancelled herein.

Interview Summaries

[0002] Interviews were held on October 21, 2008 and October 23, 2008. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Price for his courtesy and the time he took to review the Application. After the Interviews, Examiner Price indicated that certain amendments would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in light of the currently cited references. Examiner Price also indicated that, should those amendments be submitted in a Response, a new search and further consideration would be required. Applicants herewith submit amendments which Applicants believe correspond to the amendments discussed during the Interviews.

Claim Amendments

[0003] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants amend claims 1 and 46-47 herein. Applicants amend claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to

the cited references. Support for the amendments is found, at least, at page 43, line 20 to page 44, line 9.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112 2nd ¶

[0004] Claims 1, 7-35, 37, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Furthermore, in light of the amendments presented herein, Applicants submit that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicants ask the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0005] Claims 1, 7-14, 17-35, 37, and 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of Lortz. Claims 15-16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of Lortz and further in view of Mirashrafi.

Independent Claim 1

[0006] As amended, Claim 1 recites (in part):

The application program interface comprising: a plurality of open methods that can be called by an application, the open methods comprising ... a parameter for specifying a topology to be used for the presentation ... wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology ***if the application did not provide the parameter for specifying the topology to be used for the presentation as part of the call to the open methods*** (emphasis added).

[0007] During the interview it was agreed that neither Sullivan nor Mirashrafi disclose, teach, or even suggest the recital of "wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology if the application did not provide the parameter for specifying the topology to be used for the presentation as part of the call to the open methods."

[0008] With regard to Lortz, the reference describes a method for integrating and controlling audio/video devices in which:

The method according to the present invention does not require the user to use the low-level device-specific commands required to operate and integrate the various A/V devices, and allows the user to easily operate a set of A/V devices with a single command. In an alternative embodiment of the method shown in FIG. 7, before processor 10 begins construction of the filter graph, processor 10 may first determine whether a connection between the source device filter and the target device is valid (see column 7, lines 48-57, emphasis added).

If there is no possible connection, then at step 607b, processor 10 informs the user that the connection is invalid based upon the current information in topology table 90, and asks the user whether to abort the *verbal command* or modify current topology table 90 (see column 8, lines 4-8, emphasis added).

[0009] Accordingly, it was agreed that because Lortz describes using verbal commands, Lortz fails to describe, teach, or suggest an application program interface in which "wherein the partial topology is converted into a full topology if the application did not provide the parameter for specifying the topology to be used for the presentation as part of the call to the open methods."

[0010] As a result, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 7-14, 17-35, 37 and 39-45

[0011] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Thus, as discussed above, Claims 7-14, 17-35, 37 and 39-45 are allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claims 46 and 47

[0012] For reasons similar to the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 46 and 47 are also allowable and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the same.

* * * * *

Conclusion

[0013] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicants

____/Robert L. Villhard/_____ Dated: __10/31/08____

Kasey C. Christie (kasey@leehayes.com; 509-324-9256x232)

Registration No. 40559

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)

Registration No. 53,725

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com